

## **Cross-Resource Task Force Meeting Summary Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)**

### **Introduction**

The Facilitator introduced the Cross-Resource Task Force meeting. She explained the need for a cross-resource discussion. She told the group that the RAMs have been trying to map out these issues, and that the RAMs from Land Use, Recreational, and Cultural were present for the meeting.

### **Recreational**

Doug Rischbieter, the RAM for the recreational work group, distributed a cross-resource handout. He told the group that the items on the worksheet represent resource actions that have gone through a first level of screening. These items represent a conflict between the recreational resource actions and goals of other work groups. He reviewed the worksheet with the meeting attendees.

Frank Winchell of FERC asked if there would be a point where planners will be coordinating with the RAMs and use documents for recreational planning purposes. Doug answered yes, and added that the current cross-resource meeting is part of that effort.

The Facilitator went over the composite maps, which provided a visual of the different resource actions that might provide conflicts. Janis Offerman distributed the Cultural Resource Action Item Matrix.

The Facilitator introduced the Enterprise Boat Ramp Extension resource action as an example of the cross resource conflict. One participant suggested a redesign of the ramp to avoid impacting cultural resources.

One participant expressed opposition to overnight camping.

The discussion moved on to Foreman Creek (RWG-OR-37). The proponent said they simply want a picnic area and do not necessarily care where it is.

Janis mentioned the CRWG has four separate action items for Foreman Creek (CRs 1,2,5 & 29).

One participant suggested enhanced opportunities for education, while also protecting any cultural resources that are present.

One participant suggested closing the area at night.

Another participant mentioned a concerted effort by the county for law enforcement of the area.

The discussion moved on to the resource action concerning a day use area at Berry Creek (RWG-OR-49). The recreation group would like permanent access in the daytime.

One participant mentioned that there is a county road in existence, however it is impassable.

Doug mentioned a cross check with Report 15 (suitability study).

The discussion moved on to the resource action concerning a downtown riverfront park (RWG-LF27). The recreation group wants a park with interpretive facilities and a cultural center along the river.

Janis Offerman mentioned that the CRWG has resource actions concerning a cultural center however a location has not been specified.

One participant suggested broadening the Native American cultural idea to include the historic period.

Dale Hoffman of DWR reminded the group that prior to any new construction or enhancement of existing facilities, any ground disturbing activities have to undergo environmental analysis to evaluate the significance of the site.

### **Land Use**

Jim Martin, the RAM for Land Use, distributed the Land Use PM&E Worksheet. He briefly reviewed the participant groups involved in the LUWG. He then reviewed what he called the "A List" of action items. These were items he felt could represent potential cross-resource conflicts.

The Vegetative Management Plan (LWG19). One participant asked if they have contact with the Butte Fire Safe Council (BFSC). Jim mentioned that the CDF is a part of the BFSC.

Jim reminded the group to review the larger Land Use Resource Action list.

Janis Offerman reviewed the few cultural resource action items that had not been referenced during the discussion:

- CR10 – Restrictions to boats access at low water campsites.
- CR24 – Development of traditional planting areas.
- CR25 – Restricting OHV access to culturally sensitive areas.
- CR31 – Springtown Mountain.

The Facilitator concluded the meeting and reiterated that this exercise would help the evaluation effort.